DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 890 SP 006 576

AUTHOR Shugrue, Michael F.
TITLE Performance-Based Teacher Education and the Subject Matter Fields. PBTE Series No. 11.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
REPORT NO PBTE-SER-11
PUB DATE Jun 73
NOTE 31p.
AVAILABLE FROM Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite #610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Educational Innovation; Educational Programs; English Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Performance Criteria; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Evaluation; Teaching Quality

ABSTRACT

Focusing on individual abilities and needs, on objectives, and on the sharing process by which these objectives are formulated and used as the basis of evaluation--and given its efficiency (enhanced by feedback)--performance-based teacher education (PBTE) offers valuable alternatives to current curriculum requirements, course offerings, and credit and grading systems in many undergraduate departments in the arts and sciences. Subject matter specialists might object to PBTE on the basis of a general distrust of reforms or the current limited philosophic and knowledge base for PBTE. It is up to subject matter specialists, however, to broaden the research on the matter. English is a good example of a discipline clcsely related to teacher education which is undergoing a far-reaching self-examination which may lead to a redefinition of goals. Other disciplines face similar opportunities. PBTE can promote the most rigorous questioning of goals. Ultimately, each teacher can be more explicit about what he intends to do in his course, and he can begin to think of his work in terms of changes in student behavior. The question of assessment, though, is still a problem. (Related document is SP 006 578.) (JA)

ED 077890

PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION AND THE SUBJECT MATTER FIELDS

by Michael F. Shugrue

English Secretary, Modern Language Association
62 5th Avenue
New York, New York

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

for the AACTE

Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education

June 1973

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C. 20036

SP 006 576

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

This paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, through the Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas. The opinions expressed herein should not be construed as representing the opinions of the United States Government or the Texas Education Agency.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 73-79460

Standard Book Number: 91-0052-75-1

Preface

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is pleased to publish this paper as one of a series sponsored by its Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education. The series is designed to expand the knowledge base about issues, problems, and prospects regarding performance-based teacher education as identified in the first publication of the series on the state of the art.[1]

Whereas the latter is a declaration for which the Committee accepts full responsibility, publication of this paper (and the others in the PBTE Series) does not imply Association or Committee endorsement of the views expressed. It is believed, however, that the experience and expertise of these individual authors, as reflected in their writings, are such that their ideas are fruitful additions to the continuing dialogue concerning performance-based teacher education.

One of the questions which is raised when performance-based teacher education is implemented relates to its implication for the general studies and specialization components of preparation programs. In practice to date, the PBTE strategy is applied primarily to the professional studies component. It is clear, however, that the potential of this strategy for improving preparation programs is not limited to only the professional component. The Committee commissioned the author to explore the question of how PBTE relates to the subject matter fields. We believe that this study is an important contribution to the literature about PBTE.

AACTE acknowledges with appreciation the role of the National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems (NCIES) of the U. S. Office of Education in the PBTE Project. Its financial support as well as its professional stimulation are major contributions to the Committee's work. The Association acknowledges also the contribution of members of the Committee who served as readers of this paper and of members of the Project staff who assisted in its publication.

---

[1]Elam, Stanley, Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art? The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, December 1971.

Special recognition is due J. W. Maucker, chairman of the Committee, David R. Krathwohl, member of the Committee, and Shirley Bonneville of the AACTE staff, for their contributions to the development of the PBTE Series of papers.

Edward C. Pomeroy,
Executive Director, AACTE

Karl Massanari, Associate Director, AACTE, and Director of AACTE's Performance-Based Teacher Education Project

Introductory Note

Basing the program for the preparation of teachers on a specification of the competencies which they are to acquire in the course of their training is an idea that is not limited in its application solely to the professional education part of that education. It is in professional education that this notion of competency-based or performance-based teacher education (PBTE) seems to have generated the greatest number of adherents and where most of the activity has taken place to date. But it is only a matter of time before PBTE will also be a center of attention in the liberal arts and other areas related to teacher education. In these areas lie the largest portion of the course work which teachers are required to take in their programs. Further, the implications of PBTE for this portion of the program are increasingly recognized in the state legislation and state department regulations governing the certification of teachers.

It was thought important, therefore, for someone who understands the training of teachers, but who is clearly part of that larger group of faculty who are responsible for the arts and sciences part of the program, to examine the concept of competency- and performance-based teacher education. Dr. Shugrue fits that description admirably. Further, besides being a competent scholar in his own right, his background is in one of the humanistically oriented areas which have not always taken kindly to systematic (they will read the word "rigid" here) approaches to the educational process. Thus we have chosen from an area likely to be especially critical of at least certain aspects of the idea, assuring it will get the most searching review.

It is hoped that Dr. Shugrue's analysis will stimulate those readers for whom this is their first contact with this series, to examine other aspects of PBTE. As a start, to get a more complete overview, there is Elam's paper which describes the present state of the art. To get some idea of what the concept might become, futuristic scenarios of Andrews or of Cooper and Weber might be of interest. These and others in the series which might be of further interest are listed on the last page of this publication.

David R. Krathwohl, Member of
the PBTE Committee and chairman
of its Task Force on Commissioning
Papers

Foreword

The following essay discusses some of the major issues which Performance- or Competency-Based Teacher Education raises for those responsible for the general education and subject matter preparation of teachers for the schools. PBTE is a phenomenon which demands and deserves the attention of subject matter specialists engaged in the pre- and inservice education of teachers. These specialists can contribute to the success of PBTE programs in three important ways. They can strengthen the research base on which PBTE rests. They can participate in the design and conduct of programs which incorporate the best current research in subject matter fields. And they can help to devise and validate the evaluation instruments and procedures essential to any performance-based program.

For their counsel and editorial assistance, I should like to thank Eugene Asher of the A. H. A. History Education Project, Thomas Barton of Washington State University, Wallace Douglas of Northwestern University, Edmund Farrell of the National Council of Teachers of English, Bryant Fillion of the University of Illinois at Urbana, Stephen Judy of Michigan State University, Karl Massanari of AACTE, Harry Miller of Southern Illinois University, Salvatore Natoli of the Association of American Geographers, Allen Schmieder of the United States Office of Education, and Paul Varg of Michigan State University.

Michael F. Shugrue

PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION AND THE SUBJECT MATTER FIELDS

Given the frequency and intensity of the criticisms levelled against higher education in recent years, one finds it difficult to believe that academicians would be unwilling to engage in the reform of teacher education, indeed, of all of general education. Discussing the "inadequacies and irrelevance of much that presently constitutes the general studies or liberal education component" in the education of teachers, George W. Denemark has observed: "In terms of both content and process, general studies often fail to provide students with opportunities to experience what is involved in decision making and choice, the establishment of meaning, the use of evidence and logic, and collaboration toward proximate goals. Instead, they afford narrow, formalized introductions to a string of disconnected subjects superficially considered through emphasis upon nomenclature, classification systems, or the manipulation of paraphernalia."[1] In the Eleventh Charles W. Hunt Lecture, Fred T. Wilhelms assailed the liberal arts faculty because "their curricula are not only largely irrelevant, but almost deliberately so.... They almost deliberately turn their backs on relevant life purposes, preferring the technical rigors of the 'pure' and remote discipline."[2]

College and university faculty members outside of education now have the opportunity to give careful consideration to performance- or competency-based teacher education. The thrust to experiment with PBTE programs in recent years has come primarily from the United States Office of Education, from state departments of education, and from professional educators in higher education and in the schools. The growing list of publications and conferences sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education indicates, however, that subject matter specialists involved in the pre- and inservice education of teachers are beginning to attend to the potential usefulness of PBTE and to debate some of its controversial concepts.[3] Faculty members responsible for the subject matter fields, which account for some 80 percent of the teacher candidate's undergraduate work, are recognizing too that PBTE has the potential to revitalize general education, to redefine the teaching major and minor, and to reform graduate education.

Focusing as it does on individual abilities and needs, on objectives, on the sharing process by which these objectives are formulated and used as the basis of evaluation, and given its efficiency (enhanced by the use of feedback) and its student and program accountability features, PBTE offers arresting alternatives to current curriculum requirements, to course offerings and arrangements, and to credit and grading systems in many undergraduate departments in the arts and sciences.

Because "the present system of certification is ineffective in the selection of 'good teachers',"[4] PBTE offers state departments of education a tool with which to bring college, school, and community together to establish new kinds of certifiable teacher education programs which are demonstrably more successful in attracting and educating effective teachers.

With federal support, the AACTE has led in the effort "to clarify PBTE concepts, to examine their potential and identify related problems, issues, ambiguities, differences of opinion, and unanswered questions."[5] In such monographs as Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Scenario, Manchester Interview, and A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education, educators and the members of the AACTE Performance-Based Teacher Education Project Committee have demonstrated not only their willingness to explore the implications of PBTE but a healthy skepticism about PBTE or any other educational reform as a panacea for the ills of American public education. Wilford Weber and James Cooper, for example, patiently answer questions about a program that "is primarily achievement-based, not time- or experience-based."[6] Harry Broudy, on the other hand, has demanded that proponents of PBTE answer his charge that "performance-based teaching is in danger of capturing everything except what is most significant in many kinds of learning, viz., significance."[7] Impressed by "a reform movement of great potential," the AACTE Committee nonetheless acknowledges "a dangerously thin knowledge base, particularly in the area of measurement," and a still "inadequate philosophic base."[8]

The future of PBTE rests not on local, state, and federal pressures for changes in teacher education programs, but on the research and informed debate of educators and subject matter specialists. Responsible debate, in turn, is a matter of not only intellectual but social and political

import. Academicians can and should participate in determining to what extent the U. S. Office of Education's commitment to "the concept of systematic management by objectives" will "provide additional impetus to the development of performance-based teacher education programs."[9]

In at least twenty states, concepts embodied in PBTE are being used to modify or change certification requirements for teachers. Discussing the development of the Guidelines and Standards for the Development and Approval of Programs of Preparation Leading to the Certification of School Professional Personnel adopted by the Washington State Board of Education in 1971, Wendell C. Allen noted that "the relationship of state government to teacher education should be one which helps colleges change from closed to open systems in their approaches to students, school organizations, professional associations, and the community in order to make the college a participant with students and those others in preparation programs."[10] The importance of the participation of subject matter specialists in the consortia of colleges, professional associations, and school organizations authorized to plan and carry on performance-based preparation programs is emphasized by this statement: "The guidelines and standards establish a framework whereby the objectives of preparation are determined; competencies in subject matter specialties, pedagogy, and personal characteristics are delineated; and entry and exit-level competencies for each stage of preparation are specified. It is essential that preparation programs include and address competencies in subject matter knowledge as well as in the art and science of teaching, and in such human dimensions as interpersonal communication" (n. pag.). The Guidelines specifically require that college and university faculty, especially in the subject matter fields, "continue to be a major contributor to preparation and career/staff development" (p. iv).

The principles behind PBTE are an important resource on which the academician can draw to engage more fully in the planning and conduct of effective teacher education programs, to revive general education, and to reform the undergraduate curriculum. Any performance-based program is expected to offer explicit statements of its educational objectives and to take into account the specific needs and interests of students as they have expressed them. It uses the school--indeed the community and the society--as an essential resource in the educational program. It helps students to know exactly what is expected of them in any

unit or module of work, it permits students to proceed at their own pace and to repeat work until principles or techniques have been mastered. It promotes experimentation with traditional credit hour and course and classroom arrangements. It establishes a continuing process of evaluation and assessment in order to maintain a program in which students can learn readily and successfully. By stressing exit rather than entrance requirements, by emphasizing the importance of field work as well as classroom work, and by establishing alternatives to traditional grading systems, it encourages individuals of every age and from many backgrounds to enter higher education, to continue their professional growth, and to identify and prepare for new careers.

Some common objections to performance-based teacher education programs should be identified at this point. Whether they be matters of prejudice, lack of information, or differences in educational philosophy, these objections could threaten to impede careful study of PBTE by subject matter specialists. Most seriously, PBTE could be interpreted as a prime example of the "accountability fad" in education and as the latest attempt to impose a highly questionable systems approach on education. Though their contributions to the Pentagon and the Penn Central, to name only two examples, are at best debatable, systems management experts have been most successful in convincing school administrators and boards and funding agencies that a systems approach to education will improve instruction, facilitate individual learning, and guarantee more effective use of limited financial resources.

Proponents of a systems approach to education often fail, first of all, to understand the essential difference between efficiency and cost effectiveness on the factory assembly line and the intelligent, humane use of educational resources to foster individual student learning. Though they often do not intentionally capitalize on public disenchantment with educational achievement and with the rising costs of schooling, systems engineers in education have succeeded in putting educators in a vulnerable position. It is not easy, after all, to argue against a rational plea for "a clear definition of the purpose of the system, and upon the formulation of performance expectations stated specifically enough to enable the construction of criterion measures that will reveal evidence of the degree to which expected performance has been attained."[11]

Addressing himself to this issue, however, Leo Ruth explains that "the issue appears to be 'to plan or not to plan,' when actually it is a refusal to accept a restrictive, inadequate planning methodology in place of creative flexible approaches."[12] After reviewing a number of recently established and highly publicized projects using systems technology, James Hoetker asserts, "There is, to put it bluntly, no more empirical, objective evidence that the application of systems technology to instruction will contribute significantly more to improving the effectiveness or efficiency of an educational program than would the installation of an official school astrologer."[13] The emphasis in PBTE on the specification of observable, assessable performance standards leads Harry Broudy to the strong conclusion that it is "naive" to attempt "to reduce this welter of talk to overt performances that a teacher should be able to execute on demand."[14]

Controversies about the uses of systems planning in education have given rise to numbers of academic and educational publications frequently characterized by their oversimplification of complex issues. Any evaluation of PBTE must necessarily include responsible discussion of the degree to which "systems think" contributes to, or detracts from, an individual PBTE program. Opponents of systems approaches to teacher education should keep in mind, too, the caution issued by the Newman Report on Higher Education: "We must guard against a widespread tendency to trivialize the problems of efficiency in higher education. It is not only a financial problem but an intellectual one."[15]

Another objection to PBTE arises from the long-standing academic distrust of reforms initiated by the educational establishment. Because it has been fostered by professional educators and directed almost exclusively at the professional preparation of teachers, PBTE could be subject to uninformed criticism from the liberal arts and sciences for "anti-intellectualism, low academic standards, and the like." Serious consideration of the applicability of PBTE to the subject matter preparation of teachers and to the curriculum at large will come only when academicians heed the admonitions of the leaders of professional associations like Maynard Mack, who, in his presidential address to the Modern Language Association in 1970, urged his colleagues in English and in the foreign languages to "do everything in our power to establish a mutually informative and forbearing relationship with those who teach [in the schools] and those who learn there."[16]

PBTE can also be objected to as appropriate for the professional component of a prospective teacher's program but essentially unsound for the academic part of the program. Its apparent emphasis on shorter-term, observable educational objectives seems to serve better the clearly defined, immediate needs of the teacher operating daily in the school setting than the more intangible, long-term goals of a liberal education. At present, as George Henry reports, "Neither psychologists nor logicians know what acts, strategies, operations are inherent in many gross or molar behavioral goals--goals, say, like concept development, critical thinking, or induction; and therefore authorities admit that they cannot delineate and design pupil behaviors that provide the preliminary acts (practice, if you wish) to bring about the desired behavior.... Only behaviorists rush in where authorities fear to tread" (p. 19).

Proponents of PBTE have, of course, repeatedly admitted the current limited philosophic and knowledge base for PBTE, especially in the area of assessment, and they have urged subject matter specialists to help undertake the research necessary to broaden that base and to develop satisfactory measures of assessment.

Others would object that a modular approach common to existing PBTE programs threatens to trivialize the curriculum by fragmenting any subject matter into components which may help the student to develop particular skills or gain certain pieces of knowledge but which do not effectively relate the parts of a subject to one another or the work in one discipline to similar work in other disciplines. Academicians repeatedly note that the most significant experience in the liberal arts and sciences are not easily, discretely, or immediately measurable.

It might also be argued that PBTE has so heavy a career or vocational orientation that it threatens to interfere with the prospective teacher's broad and continuing exposure to the liberal arts and sciences. The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has recognized that "teaching, more than any other profession, is liberal education at work, simply given direction and insight by professional training. The danger for the student, especially toward the end of his course, is to let the wholly desirable fascination of his new professional orientation swallow up what should still be his primary concern: general or liberal education, for the teacher must first of all be an educated person."[17]

In this same vein, the emphasis on learning which will serve the prospective teacher in the real world of the school can be seen as a means of perpetuating rather than challenging the status quo in education. Any successful PBTE program must, of course, provide opportunities for the student to examine alternative kinds of education if he or she is to become a questioning, growing professional teacher. Too narrow a program, too rigid a specification that the program prepare candidates for their roles in today's schools risks producing mere teaching technicians.

At present, objections to PBTE from subject matter specialists range from the trivial and uninformed to the decidedly substantive. Significant and fruitful debate may, however, develop as academicians face up to demands to become more accountable to students, colleagues, funding agencies, and the public. They are being pressured to state objectives--in whatever terms are applicable--for their programs and courses, to defend general education and requirements for majors and minors, and to show that they are responsible participants in the education of teachers for the schools. This early period in the history of PBTE provides subject matter specialists with excellent opportunities to join their colleagues in education and in the schools in raising questions of common concern about the design, conduct, and evaluation of curriculum.

Academic departments have become noticeably more willing to discuss matters once relegated to departments and colleges of education. On many campuses they are already involved in stating objectives, determining competencies, assessing program effectiveness as well as student performance, and justifying instructional and research costs. Such interest is also increasingly reflected in the programs and publications of major professional associations throughout the country.

English may provide a good example of a discipline closely related to teacher education which is undergoing a far-reaching self-examination. In an important address to his fellow English Department chairmen, John Gerber of the University of Iowa summed up the current state of the discipline: "At the risk of sounding a bit like a behaviorist, I would suggest that our most pressing obligation at the moment is to redefine our goals in reasonably precise terms; that these goals be realizable ones that can be used as

criteria for measuring the success or failure of our programs; and that they clearly relate to the needs of students and of society, as well as reflect our own deepest convictions."[18]

As the pressure for responsible accountability and alternative teacher education programs has grown, the Curriculum Commission of the National Council of Teachers of English, which includes representatives from large and small, public and private schools and colleges, has wrestled with the possibilities and limitations of a systems approach to the teaching and learning of English which could use quantifiable, measurable behavioral objectives. In its first publication on the subject, the Commission recognized that "some major benefits might someday arise from the writing of behavioral objectives for English," but it cautioned that the task was not "to be undertaken lightly nor by lightweights" for the "process bristles with problems in semantics, philosophy, measurement, and pedagogy."[19]

Through the work of the Tri-University Project on Behavioral Objectives in English, the profession now has a modest "framework for a conceptualization of our task that will lead to freer, more open classrooms with increased student involvement in things relevant to their lives and increased skill in using their native language in all of its manifestations."[20] The project's Catalog of Representative Performance Objectives for High School English cautiously explains that "many behaviors that students are expected to demonstrate in English are relatively uncomplicated: to spell certain words in accordance with modern practice, to punctuate in harmony with clearly stated principles, to adhere to conventional patterns of word order, to read passages of appropriate difficulty and be able to answer factual questions on those passages, etc. The objectives for such tasks can be as readily stated in behavioral fashion for comparable tasks of mathematics or the science laboratory."[21]

Such catalogs are surely valuable tools for designing some modules to be incorporated into a PBTE program. Yet no one in the field would claim that the easily identified objectives listed above are the important concerns in the teaching and learning of English. Of an entirely different magnitude are the questions about an education in English posed by Caroline Shrodes of the California State University, San Francisco: "Has our teaching been designed to liberate our students from parochialism, to extend their

consciousness and accordingly the possibilities for choice? Have we helped them to make reason and intellect the conscious allies of their emotions?"[22]

The College of Education and the department of English at the University of Illinois at Urbana are currently trying to fuse the best current thinking in English to the best of PBTE in a competencies-based program for teacher education in English. Bryant Fillion states major goals for the program: "By evaluating, justifying, and clarifying the competencies with the candidates, by shifting much of the responsibility for learning to the candidate, by remaining flexible and responsive to individual candidates' needs and aspirations, by providing for individual assessment and feedback, by changing the role of the professor, and by relying heavily on the theory and practice of humanistic education, this program is intended to serve as a model to the candidate, not merely as a more efficient means of evaluation. The program's use of extended seminars, informal contact among professors, undergraduate candidates, and teachers, experience in varied and actual teaching situations, and a training-group atmosphere is an assertion that humanistic teaching, reflecting the theories of such psychologists as Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, and Arthur Combs, is both possible and worthwhile."[23]

The situation in other disciplines is not dissimilar. Most subject matter fields today are marked by a general call for greater accountability and better statements of educational aims. Geography, history, and the modern foreign languages have a growing body of theoretical discussion which has significant pedagogical implications for the teaching and learning of the subjects. Reading, mathematics, and speech have experimented widely with educational innovations. Music education and art education share a nervousness about the rigidities of systems approaches to education and narrowly conceived measures of evaluation. All of these fields share a willingness to participate in the design and conduct of more responsible teacher education programs as part of a general movement toward the restructuring of the curriculum.

The Commission on College Geography, established in 1963 by the Association of American Geographers, is a notable example of professional concern for the improvement of undergraduate courses and programs. Through its regular series of publications designed for widespread use by instructors

of college geography courses and related fields, its technical papers, and its resource papers intended for student and faculty use, the Commission has provided "continuing investigation and development and distribution of materials concerning the over-all role that modern geography should play in college curricula, including programs of study in geography and programs of study to which geography should contribute significantly."[24]

The AAG program, like those sponsored by other professional organizations such as the American Historical Association, the Modern Language Association, and the National Council of Teachers of English, to name but three, suggests the important role that professional associations can play in informing their constituents about the opportunities, challenges, and risks involved in an educational movement like PBTE. These associations clearly have an obligation to investigate the effect of PBTE programs on the subject matter preparation of teachers and to explore ways of guaranteeing the participation of academic specialists in the design, conduct, and evaluation of such programs.

If it were to offer no more, PBTE would still be a worthwhile educational phenomenon because it encourages the subject matter specialist to consider more carefully such statements as the assertion by Stanley Moses that the "traditional approach to education is no longer adequate to deal with the needs of a society where knowledge and skills change so rapidly as to make continuing education neither a luxury nor an indulgence--but a necessity. In addition, changes in the occupational structure, the amount of leisure, and, most important, the level of education of the general populace, all serve to augur a rising demand for education at different periods of life, both for work and more general cultural and leisure purposes."[25]

If they are convinced by Moses and other students of higher education, academicians must consider how the present subject matter preparation of prospective school and college teachers will have to change. They will have to define, quite specifically, how new programs will differ from existing ones. They will be forced, in effect, to state objectives for work in their fields which will enable future educators to function--let us say perform--effectively.

PBTE can promote the most rigorous questioning of goals. James Hoetker, for example, introduces to his

colleagues in the liberal arts and sciences the kinds of legitimate questions which a performance-based program poses: "What are the preferences, responses, pastimes, expenditures, companionships, activities that distinguish" the liberally educated man or woman "from those who have not had this advantage?" He inquires further, "Which of the behaviors of the liberally educated man do we actively discourage our students from exhibiting? Which of the behaviors of the uneducated man do we reward our students for exhibiting?"[26]

To help answer such questions, departments engaged in teacher education and in a review of their other programs are asked by Hoetker to identify and spell out the broad behavioral goals for a year's work in their fields. "The sensitivity to behavioral signs and processes that will develop when one is working in full consciousness of such objectives," he adds, "will lead to the emergence or the discovery of the more specific objectives" (p. 59).

Once the faculty member begins to define successfully "the things a liberally educated man does that are not done by the uneducated," he or she can then consider whether the work which a student undertakes in his or her field contributes to a truly liberal education, one which, in William Arrowsmith's words, "liberates because it sets us free to become ourselves, to realize ourselves; it frees us to learn, slowly and painfully perhaps, our limitations and our powers, and to recognize our real modalities, undeafened by the overwhelming Muzak of the social and political enterprise."[27]

The faculty member in a subject matter field can then follow Harold Taylor's directive that "each teacher be much more explicit about what he intends doing in his course. He will need to describe it in writing, and he will need to find ways of conferring with students about his work, both the students who have already been working with him and those who are trying to decide whether to or not."[28] He can determine where and how performance--even in the strictest sense of the word--can be a measure of achievement in the work which he supervises. In English, once again, students can legitimately be encouraged to "work directly with dancers, actors, composers, painters, and sculptors, and to write poems to be danced, stretches of dialogue, scenarios for film, one-act plays, critiques of art works ...."[29]

In thoughtful, honest, public statements of what they expect students to know, understand, and be able to do as a result of their work in a field, faculty members clarify their own goals, assist students in choosing and learning, and offer their objectives for public examination and assessment by colleagues and interested citizens. These are the stated goals of PBTE programs.

Questions about budgeting, faculty responsibilities, curriculum reorganization, scheduling, counseling, and testing suggest the enormous impact that PBTE could have in many colleges and universities if subject matter specialists and administrators joined their colleagues in education in studying alternatives to present practices.

The strengths of the PBTE conceptual model obviously extend far beyond the teacher education program. They are, however, most important for the design and implementation of more effective pre- and inservice teacher education programs in which subject matter specialists work more closely than ever before with those in education, with students, with practicing schoolteachers, and with the community. PBTE can become a major reform movement affecting the subject matter preparation of prospective teachers if academicians take more seriously the participation of students in the design of their own programs, the contributions which academic expertise can make to solving the problems of the schools, the opportunity to design modules which present prospective teachers with skills and knowledge which can be applied in the classroom, the chance to experiment with ways of evaluating students more effectively and motivating them to remain in teacher education programs, and the possibilities of multidisciplinary research and teaching.

The problem of assessment remains the most serious, unresolved issue in PBTE. The questions have been raised before, but they must be raised again. Who, for example, is to establish the criteria for competency or for adequate performance? How are the criteria to be distinguished for the pluralistic audiences with whom teachers work? How will any criteria by which a teacher's competency is to be established take adequately into account the mercurial nature of any class? The AACTE Committee on PBTE has warned, "We cannot be sure that measurement techniques essential both to objectivity and to valid assessment of affective and complex cognitive objectives will be developed rapidly

enough for the new exit requirements to be any better than the conventional letter grades of the past."[30]

It is true, of course, as Bryant Fillion has argued, that competencies "imply performance criteria, but they are not necessarily stated behaviorally. That is, certain competencies may be stated in terms of outcomes the teacher produces in others rather than in specific moves which the teacher himself makes. Some may only be stated as required experiences, such as passing a particular course or visiting a school, because the outcomes of such experiences, while not measurable, prove essential to the development of competence as the program defines it."[31]

The danger still exists that PBTE programs will settle for competencies stated in narrow behavioral terms and will spend their energies assessing what is least important for the creative, continuing growth of the teacher. Stephen Judy has also argued that it "seems likely that the teacher performance objectives will also be conservative, since the states will in effect be trying to locate teachers who can raise basic skills examinations scores. If the movement proceeds unchecked, English departments may find themselves under pressure to train teachers whose principal skills are leading language drill and planning seatwork."[32]

The sane voice of James Hoetker interposes: "I believe that our educational practices can be improved if teachers and administrators and curriculum writers begin to think about their work in terms of changes in student behaviors. But, as a humanist, I also think that simple-minded insistence upon <u>a priori</u> specification of all objectives in terms of conveniently observable behaviors does far more harm than good."[33] And Margaret Lindsey reminds us, "Not all information and experience needed to understand and practice the art of teaching comes from the immediate in time or space or event."[34] Indeed, as Harry Broudy notes, functioning in later life are "the residual conceptual and affective schemata, which were never tested on examinations."[35]

Recognizing the importance of this issue of assessment, the National Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers has recommended that the "idea of 'performance' and 'behavioral objectives' should probably be redefined in broader, less narrowly behavioristic terms, and in non-quantified, verbal terms."[36]

Assessment of performance remains the nagging, unsettling problem for PBTE. Subject matter departments can and must contribute their expertise to helping devise appropriate measures of assessment. A reliance on narrowly stated behavioristic competencies by those planning a PBTE program would almost guarantee that the program would fail. For prospective teachers and for all students, some activities can, of course, be readily stated in behavioral terms, but the most important attitudes and values developed through a liberal education resist such codification and evaluation.

If the issue of assessment can be resolved through the cooperation of subject matter specialists and educators, PBTE can become an educational movement of enormous force. In teacher education, indeed in all of undergraduate education, the principles of PBTE can be used by departments to involve students more fully and responsibly in their learning, to make clear and public statements of the goals of their courses and programs, to experiment with evaluation and assessment of students and programs, to introduce alternatives to traditional courses and course structures, and to involve students and faculty members more fully in the life of the school community, and society.

Footnotes

[1]"Teacher Education: Repair, Reform, or Revolution," Education for 1984 and After, ed. Paul Olson, et. al. Sponsored by the Directorate of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, 1972,

[2]"Realignments for Teacher Education," Realignments for Teacher Education, ed. Esther D. Hemsing (Washington, D. C.: AACTE, 1970), p. 21.

[3]See particularly Stanley Elam, Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art? (December 1971) and Performance-Based Teacher Education: An Annotated Bibliography (August 1972).

[4]The University Can't Train Teachers, ed. Paul Olson, et. al. (Lincoln: Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, 1972), p. 92.

[5]A Resumé of Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art? (March 1972), p. 1.

[6]Scenario (June 1972), p. 3.

[7]Critique (May 1972), p. 11.

[8]Resumé, p. 3.

[9]William L. Smith, "Foreword" to Resumé, p. 2. The interest of the USOE in promoting PBTE is documented by Iris M. Elfenbein in PBTE: A Comparative Description (Washington, D. C.: AACTE, October 1972), p. 40.

[10]"The Role of the State in Teacher Education," Realignments for Teacher Education, p. 49.

[11]Bela H. Banathy, Instructional Systems (Palo Alto: Fearon Publishers, 1968), p. 21.

[12]"Dangers of Systemthink in Education," Accountability and the Teaching of English, ed. Henry B. Maloney (Urbana: NCTE, 1972), p. 67. See also George Henry's Behavior in English, pp. 9-21, in this collection.

[13]Systems, Systems Approaches, and the Teacher (Urbana: NCTE, 1972), pp. 27-28.

[14]Critique, p. 5.

[15]Report on Higher Education, Frank Newman, Chairman (Washington, D. C.: USOE, 1971), p. 32.

[16]"To See It Feelingly," PMLA (May 1971), p. 370.

[17]"Teacher Education in Liberal Arts Colleges," Document No. 465 of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (1969), p. 2.

[18]"Public Hostility to the Academy: What Can Chairmen of Departments of English Do?", ADE Bulletin (February 1972), p. 20.

[19]On Writing Behavioral Objectives for English, ed. John Maxwell and Anthony Tovatt (Champaign: NCTE, 1970), p. ix.

[20]Donald A. Seybold, "Performance Objectives--Maybe," Accountability and the Teaching of English, p. 107.

[21]Preliminary Catalog (Champaign: Tri-University Project, 1970), p. 7. Published by J. N. Hook, et. al. as Representative Performance Objectives for High School English (New York: Ronald Press, 1971).

[22]"The Scholars and the Anti-Self," ADE Bulletin (September 1970), pp. 7-8.

[23] Draft Proposal for a Three-Year Project to Develop and Evaluate a Competencies-Based Program for Teacher Training in English (November 1971), p. 3.

[24] A Summary of the Activities of the Commission on College Geography (Tempe: Arizona State University, April 1972), p. 1.

[25] The Learning Force: A More Comprehensive Framework for Educational Policy (Syracuse: Syracuse University Publications, 1971), p. 13.

[26] "Limitations and Advantages of Behavioral Objectives in the Arts and Humanities," On Writing Behavioral Objectives for English, p. 54.

[27] "Teaching and the Liberal Arts: Notes Toward an Old Frontier," The Liberal Arts and Teacher Education, ed. Donald Bigelow (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971), p. 12.

[28] How to Change Colleges (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), p. 79.

[29] Taylor, p. 158.

[30] Resumé, p. 6.

[31] A Competencies-Based Program for Teacher Training in English, p. 7.

[32] "English Education and the Department of English: Some Prospects and Priorities," ADE Bulletin (September 1972),

[33] "Limitations and Advantages of Behavioral Objectives in the Arts and Humanities," p. 50.

[34] "Speculations on the Future of Teacher Education and Cooperative Endeavors," p. 287.

[35] Critique, p. 6.

[36] The University Can't Train Teachers, p. vii.

ABOUT THE TEXAS TEACHER CENTER PROJECT

The AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education serves as the national component of the Texas Teacher Center Project. This Project was initiated in July, 1970, through a grant to the Texas Education Agency from the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, USOE. The Project was initially funded under the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program and the national component was subcontracted by the Texas Education Agency to AACTE.

One of the original thrusts of the Texas Teacher Center Project was to conceptualize and field test performance-based teacher education programs in pilot situations and contribute to a statewide effort to move teacher certification to a performance base. By the inclusion of the national component in the Project, the Texas Project made it possible for all efforts in the nation related to performance-based teacher education to gain national visibility. More important, it gave to the nation a central forum where continuous study and further clarification of the performance-based movement might take place.

While the Texas Teacher Center Project is of particular interest to AACTE's Performance-Based Teacher Education Committee, the services of the Committee are available, within its resources, to all states, colleges and universities, and groups concerned with the improvement of preparation programs for school personnel.

ABOUT AACTE

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is an organization of more than 860 colleges and universities joined together in a common interest: more effective ways of preparing educational personnel for our changing society. It is national in scope, institutional in structure, and voluntary. It has served teacher education for 55 years in professional tasks which no single institution, agency, organization, or enterprise can accomplish alone.

AACTE's members are located in every state of the nation and in Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Collectively, they prepare more than 90 percent of the teaching force that enters American schools each year.

The Association maintains its headquarters in the National Center for Higher Education, in Washington, D. C.--the nation's capital, which also in recent years has become an educational capital. This location enables AACTE to work closely with many professional organizations and government agencies concerned with teachers and their preparation.

In AACTE headquarters, a stable professional staff is in continuous interaction with other educators and with officials who influence education, both in immediate actions and future thrusts. Educators have come to rely upon the AACTE headquarters office for information, ideas, and other assistance and, in turn, to share their aspirations and needs. Such interaction alerts the staff and officers to current and emerging needs of society and of education and makes AACTE the center for teacher education. The professional staff is regularly out in the field--nationally and internationally--serving educators and keeping abreast of the "real world." The headquarters office staff implements the Association's objectives and programs, keeping them vital and valid.

Through conferences, study committees, commissions, task forces, publications, and projects, AACTE conducts a program relevant to the current needs of those concerned with better preparation programs for educational personnel. Major programmatic thrusts are carried out by commissions on international education, multicultural education, and accreditation standards. Other activities include government relations and a consultative service in teacher education.

A number of activities are carried on collaboratively. These include major fiscal support for and selection of higher education representatives on the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education--an activity sanctioned by the National Commission on Accrediting and a joint enterprise of higher education institutions represented by AACTE, organizations of school board members, classroom teachers, state certification officers, and chief state school officers.

The Association headquarters provides several secretariat services which help make teacher education more interdisciplinary and comprehensive: the Associated Organizations of Teacher Education and the International Council on Education for Teaching. A major interest in teacher education provides a common bond between AACTE and fraternal organizations.

AACTE is deeply concerned with and involved in the major education issues of the day. Combining the considerable resources inherent in the consortium--constituted through a national voluntary association--with strengths of others creates a synergism of exceptional productivity and potentiality. Serving as the nerve center and spokesman for major efforts to improve education personnel, the Association brings to its task credibility, built-in cooperation and communications, contributions in cash and kind, and diverse staff and membership capabilities.

AACTE provides a capability for energetically, imaginatively, and effectively moving the nation forward through better prepared educational personnel. From its administration of the pioneering educational television program, "Continental Classroom," to its involvement of 20,000 practitioners, researchers, and decision makers in developing the current Recommended Standards for Teacher Education, to many other activities, AACTE has demonstrated its organizational and consortium qualification and experiences in conceptualizing, studying and experimenting, communicating, and implementing diverse thrusts for carrying out socially and educationally significant activities. With the past as prologue, AACTE is proud of its history and confident of its future among the "movers and doers" seeking continuous renewal of national aspirations and accomplishments through education.

AACTE PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION
PROJECT COMMITTEE

Chairman: J. W. MAUCKER, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Academic Affairs Office, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas 66801.

Vice-Chairman: DONALD J. MCCARTY, Dean, College of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

WILLIAM W. BARR, Student, School of Education, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado 80210.

ELBERT BROOKS, Superintendent of Schools, Metropolitan Schools, 2601 Bransford Avenue, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

PATRICK L. DALY, Social Studies Teacher, Edsel Ford High School, 20601 Rotunda Drive, Dearborn, Michigan 48124.

K. FRED DANIEL, Associate for Planning and Coordination, State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida 32304.

WILLIAM H. DRUMMOND, Professor of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601.

TOMMY FULTON, Art Teacher, Jarman Jr. High School, Midwest City, Oklahoma 73110.

WILLIAM A. JENKINS, Dean, School of Education, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon 97207.

LORRIN KENNAMER, Dean, College of Education, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.

DAVID KRATHWOHL, Dean, College of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210.

MARGARET LINDSEY, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

DONALD M. MEDLEY, Professor of Education, School of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903.

YOURA QUALLS, Head, Humanities Division, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 36088.

ATILANO VALENCIA, Head, Department of Education, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, New Mexico 87001.

PAUL VARG, Professor of History, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

Liaison Representatives:

THEODORE ANDREWS, Associate in Teacher Education, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, New York State Department of Education, Albany, New York 12204 (Multi-State Consortium).

NORMAN DODL, Associate Professor, Department of Elementary Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306 (Elementary Education Model Program Directors).

HARLAN FORD, Assistant Commissioner of Education (or TOM RYAN) Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas 78701.

NORMAN JOHNSON, Chairman, Department of Education, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina 27707 (Southern Consortium).

KYLE KILLOUGH, Director, Texas Educational Renewal Center, 6504 Tracor Lane, Austin, Texas 78721 (Texas Teacher Center Project).

DONALD ORLOSKY, Professor of Education and Associate Director of Leadership Training Institute, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

BENJAMIN ROSNER, University Dean of Teacher Education, Office of Teacher Education, the City University of New York, 1411 Broadway, Room 1119, New York, New York 10018 (Task Force '72 Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education).

ALLEN SCHMIEDER, Chief, Operations Coordination, National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C. 20202 (Office of Education).

EMMITT SMITH, Vice President, Program Development and Resources, West Texas State University, Canyon, Texas 79015 (Texas Teacher Center Project).

Staff:

KARL MASSANARI, Director
GORDON COOK, Assistant Director
SHIRLEY BONNEVILLE, Program Assistant
BRENDA GREENHOWE, Secretary
SHARON DEVEAUUSE, Secretary

PUBLICATION ORDER FORM FOR PBTE PAPERS

Number of Copies	PBTE Series	
_____	#1	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?" by Stan Elam @ $2.00
_____	#2	"The Individualized, Competency-Based System of Teacher Education at Weber State College" by Caseel Burke @ $2.00
_____	#3	"Manchester Interview: Competency-Based Teacher Education/ Certification" by Theodore Andrews @ $2.00
_____	#4	"A Critique of PBTE" by Harry S. Broudy @ $2.00
_____	#5	"Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Scenario" by James Cooper and Wilford Weber @ $2.00
_____	#6	"Changing Teacher Education in a Large Urban University" by Frederic T. Giles and Clifford Foster @ $3.00
_____	#7	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: An Annotated Bibliography" by AACTE and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education @ $3.00
_____	#8	"Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs: A Comparative Description" by Iris Elfenbein @ $3.00
_____	#9	"Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene" by Allen A. Schmieder (jointly with ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education) @ $3.00
_____	#10	"A Humanistic Approach to Performance-Based Teacher Education" by Paul Nash @ $2.00
_____	#11	"Performance-Based Teacher Education and the Subject Matter Fields" by Michael F. Shugrue @ $2.00
_____	#12	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: Some Measurement and Decision Making Considerations" by Jack C. Merwin @ $2.00

BILLED ORDERS: Billed orders will be accepted only when made on official purchase orders of institutions, agencies, or organizations. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Payment must accompany all other orders. There are no minimum orders.

DISCOUNTS: A 10 percent discount is allowed on purchase of five or more publications of any one title. A 10 percent discount is allowed on all orders by wholesale agencies.

Payment enclosed _____ Amount _____

Purchase Order No. _____

NAME _____
(Please print or type)

ADDRESS _____

_____ ZIP CODE _____

Please address: Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite #610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036.

ORDER FORM FOR RECENT AACTE PUBLICATIONS

Number of Copies

"The Profession, Politics, and Society" (1972 Yearbook)

_____ Volume I and Volume II @ $6.00

_____ Volume I (Proceedings) Only @ $4.00

_____ Volume II (Directory) Only @ $3.00

_____ "Power and Decision Making in Teacher Education" (1971 Yearbook) @ $6.00

_____ "What Kind of Environment Will Our Children Have?" @ $2.50

_____ "Social Change and Teacher Education" @ $2.50

_____ "Systems and Modeling: Self-Renewal Approaches to Teacher Education" @ $3.25

_____ "Excellence in Teacher Education" (Limited Supply) @ $1.00

_____ "Beyond the Upheaval" @ $1.00

_____ "In West Virginia, It Is Working" @ $2.00

_____ "Educational Personnel for the Urban Schools: What Differentiated Staffing Can Do" @ $2.00

_____ "An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates" @ $2.00

BILLED ORDERS: Billed orders will be accepted only when made on official purchase orders of institutions, agencies, or organizations. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Payment must accompany all other orders. There are no minimum orders.

Payment enclosed _____ Amount _____

Purchase Order No. _____

NAME _____
(Please print or type)

ADDRESS _____

_____ ZIP CODE _____

Please address: Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite #610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036.